

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-47 are pending in this Application.

Claims 1, 10, 13, 14, 27, 40, 41, 44, and 47 have been amended. Claims 1-47 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 1-47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,249,281 to Chen et al. (hereinafter "Chen"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,396,500 to Qureshi et al. (hereinafter "Qureshi"), in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,510,553 to Hazra (hereinafter "Hazra").

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-48 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Chen in view of Qureshi and Hazra. The Office Action alleges that the combination of references teach or disclose all of the claimed limitations of the corresponding claims and that one having ordinary skill in that art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of Chen with the teachings of Qureshi and Hazra.

Applicants, however, respectfully submit that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established by the evidence presented in the Office Action. In order to establish a prima facie showing of obviousness, three requirements must be satisfied: all limitations of a pending claim must be expressly or impliedly disclosed by prior art references; there must be a suggestion or motivation in the art for the ordinarily skilled artisan to combine the limitations; and there must be a reasonable expectation of success in making such a combination. (M.P.E.P. § 2143).

Applicants respectfully submit that Chen, Qureshi, and Hazra, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest one or more of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1-48.

The Office Action fails to provide evidence to support the first requirement for a showing of obviousness where one or more prior art references expressly or impliedly disclose all limitations of the corresponding claims.

For example, on page 9, the Office Action alleges that the subject matter of claims 41-48 reads on the discussion in Hazra of “switching streams.” Applicants respectfully disagree.

For example, claim 41 recites comparing a first frame of video to a subsequent second frame of video and identifying the second frame as different from the first frame. The Abstract of Hazra fails to mention anything regarding a comparison between a first frame of video and a second frame of video.

In Col. 5, lines 5-56, Hazra suggests that client machines can switch between two active signal sources (or any number). Hazra merely discloses starting in line 52 of Col. 5 that a graphical user interface is used to select a desired multimedia content as a primary source for a first layer of a stream and another multimedia content as a secondary layer of a stream. Thus, in Hazra, the user is merely selecting which video stream will be in the larger window, and which different video stream will be in the Picture window. However, simply switching between different video streams is substantially different from comparing a first frame of video and a subsequent second frame of video and identifying the second frame as different from the first frame as recited in claim 41. Hazra fails to teach or suggest that a subsequent frame is compared to a first frame and identified as different as recited in claims 41 and 44.

In Col. 6, lines 35-67, Hazra merely suggest that a video stream may comprise a plurality of layers, and support different frame rates, frame sizes, and encodings. However, Hazra fails to teach or suggest a comparison with a predetermined threshold as recited in claim 42 and 45, comparing image pixels of the first frame of video and the second frame of video as recited in claim 43 and 46, and selecting frames of video at a predetermined sampling interval as recited in claim 47.

Amended claim 1 recites the feature of “differencing between a first video frame and a second video frame, at the adapter, of the video information received from the first system or the capture device.” However, as discussed above, Hazra merely suggests that a user select which of two video stream to watch, which is substantially different from differencing between a

first video frame and a second video frame of the video information received from the first system or the capture device as recited in claim 1.

Additionally, amended claim 1 recites the feature of “selecting based on the differencing, at the adapter, a set of one or more keyframes from the video information received from the first system or the capture device in response to a user-configurable threshold.” The combination of Chen, Qureshi, and Hazra fails to teach or suggest the above limitation.

The Office Action further alleges that Hazra discloses a technique for extracting keyframes from a video sequence, and using them to synchronize with additional data in Col. 7, lines 24-61. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Hazra does not extract keyframes from a video sequence as alleged in the Office Action.

In Col. 7, lines 24-61, Hazra is simply suggesting that a client system can switch between base video layers shown in a Picture-in-Picture format (PIP). The client system also subscribes to an enhancement layer (e.g., the audio feed) corresponding to the primary source (e.g., the video layer in the main window). When the client switches between the base video layers, for example, by selecting the video in the picture window, the enhancement layer associated with the new primary source is outputted. In this regard, Hazra merely suggests that “[t]he switch may be delayed by a small time interval so that subscription changes may be synchronized with key frames that are assumed to be present at regular intervals.” (Hazra: Col. 7, lines 46-49). Applicants fail to see how delaying a switch between audio signals to initiated playback when keyframes in the base video feed that are assumed to be present in Hazra translates into a technique for extracting keyframes as alleged in the Office Action.

A suggestion to synchronize audio to keyframes that may be present in a video feed as in Hazra is substantially different from actually extracting those keyframes as alleged. Hazra merely suggests that the keyframes are assumed to be present at regular intervals, and thus one merely has to wait or delay the audio for the assumed period of time (i.e., the regular interval) or a portion thereof, to commence playback. This is completely different from a technique of extracting the keyframe.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Chen, Qureshi, and Hazra, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation recited in

amended claim 1. For example, as discussed above, amended claim 1 recites the feature of “selecting based on the differencing, at the adapter, a set of one or more keyframes from the video information received from the first system or the capture device in response to a user-configurable threshold.” Hazra fails to teach or suggest the above recited feature. Even assuming, for the sack of argument, that Hazra did extract a keyframe, Hazra fails to teach or suggest that such an extraction is performed based on a differencing between a first video frame and a second video frame, and in response to a user configurable threshold.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 14, 27, and 40, are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above, and others. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-13, 15-26, 28-39, and 41-47 that depend directly and/or indirectly from the independent claims 1, 14, 27, and 40 respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons, some of which are discussed above.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter/  
Sean F. Parmenter  
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 925-472-5000  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
SFP:lls  
61149452 v1